arXiv:1605.01969v1 [math.FA] 6 May 2016

SZLENK AND w^*-DENTABILITY INDICES OF $C(K)$

R.M. CAUSEY

Abstract. Given any compact, Hausdorff space K and $1 < p < \infty$, we compute the Szlenk and w^*-dentability indices of the spaces $C(K)$ and $L_p(C(K))$. We show that if K is compact, Hausdorff, scattered, $CB(K)$ is the Cantor-Bendixson index of K, and ξ is the minimum ordinal such that $CB(K) \leqslant \omega^\xi$, then $Sz(C(K)) = \omega^\xi$ and $Dz(C(K)) = Sz(L_p(C(K))) = \omega^{1+\xi}$.

1. Definitions

Two ordinal indices, the Szlenk index [18] and w^*-dentability index, have been used to classify and study Asplund spaces. These indices are distinct, but happen to coincide for a large class of spaces. Indeed, due to a result of Hájek and Schlumprecht [9], the Szlenk and w^*-dentability indices coincide for those Banach spaces whose Szlenk index lies in the interval $[\omega^\omega, \omega_1]$. Here, ω denotes the first infinite ordinal and ω_1 is the first uncountable ordinal. Since each index has applications to renorming theory, we seek to better understand the relationship between them. Given a Banach space X, a w^*-compact subset K of X^*, and $\varepsilon > 0$, we let $s_\varepsilon(K)$ denote those $x^* \in K$ such that for every w^*-neighborhood V of x^*, $\operatorname{diam}(V \cap K) > \varepsilon$. We let $d_\varepsilon(K)$ denote those $x^* \in K$ such that for every w^*-open slice S containing x^*, $\operatorname{diam}(S \cap K) > \varepsilon$. We recall that a w^*-open slice in X^* is a subset of X^* of the form $\{y^* \in X^* : \operatorname{Re} y^*(x) > a\}$ for some $a \in \mathbb{R}$ and $x \in X$. Of course, $s_\varepsilon(K) \subset d_\varepsilon(K)$. We define

$$s_\varepsilon^0(K) = d_\varepsilon^0(K) = K,$$

$$s_\varepsilon^{\xi+1}(K) = s_\varepsilon(s_\varepsilon^\xi(K)), \quad d_\varepsilon^{\xi+1}(K) = d_\varepsilon(d_\varepsilon^\xi(K)),$$

and if ξ is a limit ordinal,

$$s_\varepsilon^\xi(K) = \bigcap_{\zeta<\xi} s_\varepsilon^\zeta(K), \quad d_\varepsilon^\xi(K) = \bigcap_{\zeta<\xi} d_\varepsilon^\zeta(K).$$

Note that for every $\varepsilon > 0$ and every ordinal ξ, $s_\varepsilon^\xi(K), d_\varepsilon^\xi(K)$ are w^*-compact, and $s_\varepsilon^\xi(K) \subset d_\varepsilon^\xi(K)$. Moreover, if K is convex, so is $d_\varepsilon^\xi(K)$. We let $Sz_\varepsilon(K) = \min\{\xi : s_\varepsilon^\xi(K) = \varnothing\}$ if this class is non-empty, and we write $Sz_\varepsilon(K) = \infty$ otherwise. We let $Sz(K) = \sup_{\varepsilon>0} Sz_\varepsilon(K)$, with the convention that this supremum is ∞ if $Sz_\varepsilon(K) = \infty$ for some $\varepsilon > 0$. We define $Dz_\varepsilon(K)$, $Dz(K)$ similarly. Given a Banach space X, we let $Sz(X) = Sz(B_{X^*})$ and $Dz(X) = Dz(B_{X^*})$. If $\Phi : X \to Y$ is an operator, we define $Sz(\Phi) = Sz(\Phi^* B_{Y^*})$. The index $Sz(X)$ is the *Szlenk index* of X, and $Dz(X)$ is the *w^*-dentability index* of X. We observe that $Sz(K) \leqslant Dz(K)$ for any w^*-compact K.

Given a compact, Hausdorff space K, we let K' denote the Cantor-Bendixson derivative of K. That is, K' consists of those points in K which are not isolated in K. Note that K' is closed in K, and so is compact, Hausdorff with its relative topology as long as it is non-empty. We define

$$K^0 = K,$$
$$K^{\xi+1} = (K^\xi)',$$

and if ξ is a limit ordinal, we let

$$K^\xi = \bigcap_{\zeta<\xi} K^\zeta.$$

We let $CB(K)$ denote the Cantor-Bendixson index of K, which is the minimum ordinal ξ such that $K^\xi = \varnothing$ if such an ordinal exists, and otherwise we write $CB(K) = \infty$. The space K is said to be *scattered* if $CB(K)$ is an ordinal. A standard compactness argument yields that if K is scattered, $CB(K)$ is a successor ordinal. If K is scattered, we let $\Gamma(K)$ denote the minimum ordinal ξ such that $CB(K) \leqslant \omega^\xi$. Note that the inequality $CB(K) \leqslant \omega^\xi$ is strict except in the trivial case that $CB(K) = 1$ (that is, when K is finite), since $CB(K)$ cannot be a limit ordinal, while ω^ξ is a limit ordinal for any $\xi > 0$. If K is not scattered, we let $\Gamma(K) = \infty$. We agree to the convention that $\omega\infty = \infty$.

Our proofs work for both the real and complex scalars. In what follows, $C(K)$ is the Banach space of continuous, scalar-valued functions defined on the compact, Hausdorff space K. Given a Banach space X and $1 < p < \infty$, $L_p(X)$ denotes the space of (equivalence classes of) Bochner-integrable, X-valued functions defined on $[0, 1]$ with Lebesgue measure.

Theorem 1.1. *For any compact, Hausdorff K and any $1 < p < \infty$,*

$$Sz(C(K)) = \Gamma(K),$$
$$Dz(C(K)) = Sz(L_p(C(K))) = \omega\Gamma(K).$$

For any ordinals ξ, ζ such that $\omega^\zeta \leqslant \xi < \omega^{\zeta+1}$, it is easy to see that $CB([0, \xi]) = \zeta + 1$. Thus our results recover the known facts that if $\omega^{\omega^\zeta} \leqslant \xi < \omega^{\omega^{\zeta+1}}$, $Sz(C([0, \xi])) = \omega^{\zeta+1}$. This was shown by Samuel [15] in the case that ξ is countable, by Lancien and Hájek when $\xi < \omega_1\omega$, and by Brooker [3] in the general case. We also recover the values of $Dz([0, \xi])$ and $Sz(L_p(C([0, \xi])))$, which was shown for countable ξ in [8], and in the general case by Brooker [3].

2. Preliminaries

We collect a few facts concerning the Szlenk and w^*-dentability indices.

Proposition 2.1. *Let X be a Banach space.*

(i) If X is isomorphic to a subspace of Y, then $Sz(X) \leqslant Sz(Y)$ and $Dz(X) \leqslant Dz(Y)$.
(ii) $Sz(X) = 1$ if and only if $\dim X < \infty$, and otherwise $Sz(X) \geqslant \omega$.
(iii) $Dz(X) = 1$ if and only if $X = \{0\}$, and otherwise $Dz(X) \geqslant \omega$.

(iv) $Sz(X) = \infty$ *if and only if* $Dz(X) = \infty$ *if and only if* X *fails to be Asplund.*

(v) For any Asplund space X*, there exist ordinals* ξ, ζ *such that* $Sz(X) = \omega^\xi$ *and* $Dz(X) = \omega^\zeta$*.*

(vi) For any $1 < p < \infty$*,* $Dz(X) \leqslant Sz(L_p(X))$*.*

(vii) For any Banach space Y*,* $Sz(X \oplus Y) = \max\{Sz(X), Sz(Y)\}$*.*

(viii) If Y *is a Banach space and* $\Phi : X \to Y$ *is an isomorphic embedding,* $Sz(\Phi) = Sz(X)$*.*

(ix) For any $K, L \subset X^*$ w^**-compact,* $\varepsilon > 0$*, and any ordinal* ξ*, if* $K \subset L + \varepsilon B_{X^*}$*, then*

$$s^\xi_{12\varepsilon}(K) \subset s^\xi_{3\varepsilon}(L) + \varepsilon B_{X^*}.$$

Items (i)-(vi) can be found in the survey paper [11]. Item (vii) was stated in [7] in the case that $Y = X$, but the proof yields the version here. Item $(viii)$ is due to Brooker [2].

The idea for (ix) is in [10, Lemma 6.2], alhough the statement was slightly different. We give the proof of item (ix) as it is stated here.

Proof of (ix). By induction. The $\xi = 0$ case is clear. Assume ξ is a limit ordinal and the result holds for every $\zeta < \xi$, and fix $x^* \in s^\xi_{12\varepsilon}(K)$. For every $\zeta < \xi$, since $x^* \in s^\zeta_{12\varepsilon}(K) \subset s^\zeta_{3\varepsilon}(L) + \varepsilon B_{X^*}$, we may fix $y^*_\zeta \in s^\zeta_{3\varepsilon}(L)$ and $z^*_\zeta \in \varepsilon B_{X^*}$ such that $x^* = y^*_\zeta + z^*_\zeta$. We pass to a subnet $(y^*_\lambda)_{\lambda\in D}$ of $(y^*_\zeta)_{\zeta<\xi}$ with w^*-limit $y^* \in s^\xi_{3\varepsilon}(L)$ and note that over the same subnet, $z^*_\lambda \underset{\lambda\in D, w^*}{\to} x^* - y^* \in \varepsilon B_{X^*}$. Therefore $x^* = y^* + z^* \in s^\xi_{3\varepsilon}(L) + \varepsilon B_{X^*}$. Last, assume the result holds for some ordinal ξ and suppose $x^* \in s^{\xi+1}_{12\varepsilon}(K)$. Fix a net $(x^*_\lambda) \subset s^\xi_{12\varepsilon}(K)$ converging w^* to x^* and such that for every λ, $\|x^*_\lambda - x^*\| > 6\varepsilon$. For every λ, fix $y^*_\lambda \in s^\xi_{3\varepsilon}(L)$ and $z^*_\lambda \in \varepsilon B_{X^*}$ such that $x^*_\lambda = y^*_\lambda + z^*_\lambda$. By passing to a subnet, we may assume $y^*_\lambda \underset{w^*}{\to} y^* \in s^\xi_{3\varepsilon}(L)$ and note that over the same subnet, $z^*_\lambda \underset{w^*}{\to} x^* - y^* \in \varepsilon B_{X^*}$. For every λ,

$$\|y^*_\lambda - y^*\| = \|x^*_\lambda - z^*_\lambda - x^* + x^* - y^*\| \geqslant \|x^*_\lambda - x^*\| - \|z^*_\lambda\| - \|x^* - y^*\| > 6\varepsilon - 2\varepsilon > 3\varepsilon.$$

From this it follows that $y^* \in s^{\xi+1}_{3\varepsilon}(L)$.

□

Rudin [14] showed that if K is compact, Hausdorff, scattered, $C(K)^* = \ell_1(K)$, where the canonical $\ell_1(K)$ basis is the set of Dirac functionals $\{\delta_x : x \in K\}$. By a result of Namioka and Phelps [13], if K is scattered, $C(K)$ is Asplund. We note that a Banach space X is an Asplund space if and only if every separable subspace of X has separable dual. This was shown in [6] in the real case, and it is explained in [2] how to deduce the complex case from the real case. Stegall [17] showed that if every separable subspace of X has separable dual, then X^* has the Radon-Nikodym property. It follows from [5, Page 98] that if X^* has the Radon-Nikodym property, for any $1 < p < \infty$, $L_p(X)^* = L_q(X^*)$ via the canonical embedding of $L_q(X^*)$ into $L_p(X)^*$. Here, $1/p + 1/q = 1$. Therefore if K is scattered and $1 < p < \infty$, $L_p(C(K))^* = L_q(\ell_1(K))$.

Given a closed subset F of K, we let $C_F(K)$ denote those $f \in C(K)$ such that $f|_F \equiv 0$. If $F = \varnothing$, we let $C_F(K) = C(K)$. If K is scattered, we let $K_\infty = K^{CB(K)-1}$. This is

well-defined, since $CB(K)$ is a successor ordinal. We let $C_0(K) = C_{K_\infty}(K)$. Note that K_∞ is finite and non-empty, so $0 < \dim C(K)/C_0(K) < \infty$. From this it follows that $L_p(C(K))$ is isomorphic to $L_p(C_0(K)) \oplus L_p$. Then if K is infinite,

$$\begin{aligned} Sz(L_p(C(K))) &= \max\{Sz(L_p(C_0(K))), Sz(L_p)\} = \max\{Sz(L_p(C_0(K))), \omega\} \\ &= Sz(L_p(C_0(K))). \end{aligned}$$

If K is finite, $K_\infty = K$ and $C_0(K) = \{0\}$, so that

$$Sz(L_p(C(K))) = Sz(L_p) = \omega,$$

since L_p is asymptotically uniformly smooth. This shows that in the non-trivial case that K is infinite, to compute the Szlenk index of $L_p(C(K))$, it is sufficient to compute the Szlenk index of $L_p(C_0(K))$.

With $F \subset K$ still closed, we let $\approx_F$ denote the equivalence relation on K given by $s \approx_F t$ if $s = t$ or if $s, t \in F$. We let K/F denote the space of equivalence classes $[s]$ of members s of K and endow K/F with the quotient topology coming from the function χ_F given by $\chi_F(s) \mapsto [s]$. Of course, the equivalence classes in K/F are F and $\{s\}$, $s \in K \setminus F$. Note that $C_F(K)$ is canonically isometrically isomorphic to $C_{\{F\}}(K/F)$ via the operator $T : C_{\{F\}}(K/F) \to C_F(K)$ given by $Tf(t) = f(\chi_F(t))$. If $F = K^\gamma$ for some $\gamma < CB(K)$, it is straightforward to check that for $0 \leqslant \zeta \leqslant \gamma$, then $(K/K^\gamma)^\zeta = q_F(K^\zeta)$. In particular, $(K/K^\gamma)^\gamma = \{K^\gamma\}$, and $CB(K/K^\gamma) = \gamma + 1$. This means that $(K/K^\gamma)_\infty$, the last non-empty Cantor-Bendixson derivative of K/K^γ, is the space consisting of the single equivalence class K^γ. From this and our previous remarks, it follows that $C_{K^\gamma}(K)$ is isometrically isomorphic to $C_0(K/K^\gamma)$.

Note that the restriction map $\rho_F : C(K) \to C(F)$ given by $f \mapsto f|_F$ is a quotient map by the Tietze extension theorem. The adjoint $\rho_F^* : \ell_1(F) \to \ell_1(K)$ is the inclusion, and $\rho_F^* B_{\ell_1(F)} = \{\mu \in B_{\ell_1(K)} : |\mu|(K \setminus F) = 0\}$, which we identify with $B_{\ell_1(F)}$ throughout. Note that this identification is a linear, w^*-w^*-continuous isometry, so that for any ordinal ξ and any $\varepsilon > 0$, $s_\varepsilon^\xi(B_{\ell_1(F)}) = s_\varepsilon^\xi(\rho_F^* B_{\ell_1(F)})$ and $d_\varepsilon^\xi(B_{\ell_1(F)}) = d_\varepsilon^\xi(\rho_F^* B_{\ell_1(F)})$. We will use this fact throughout. Moreover, if $R_F : L_p(C(K)) \to L_p(C(F))$ is the restriction given by $R_F f(t) = f(t)|_F$, $R_F^* : L_q(\ell_1(F)) \to L_q(\ell_1(K))$ is the inclusion, and we may identify $B_{L_q(\ell_1(F))}$ with its image under R_F^* when computing the Szlenk and w^*-derivations.

Let $\varphi_F : C_F(K) \to C(K)$, $\Phi_F : L_p(C_F(K)) \to L_p(C(K))$ denote the inclusions. Moreover, with this identification, Note that $L_q(\ell_1(F))$ is canonically included in $L_q(\ell_1(K)) = L_p(C(K))^*$, and

$$L_p(C_F(K))^\perp = L_q(C_F(K)^\perp) = L_q(\ell_1(F)).$$

From this it follows that $L_q(\ell_1(F))$ is w^*-closed in $L_q(\ell_1(K))$ and

$$L_p(C_F(K))^* = L_q(\ell_1(K))/L_q(\ell_1(F)).$$

Note that any operator $p : \ell_1(K) \to \ell_1(K)$ extends to a function $P : L_q(\ell_1(K)) \to L_q(\ell_1(K))$ given by $(Pf)(t) = p(f(t))$, and $\|P\| = \|p\|$. Let $p_F : \ell_1(K) \to \ell_1(F) \subset \ell_1(K)$ be the

canonical projection, and let q_F denote the complementary projection $I_{\ell_1(K)} - p_F$. Note that $\|q_F\|, \|p_F\| \leqslant 1$. Given an ordinal $\gamma < CB(K)$, we let p_γ, q_γ denote the projections p_{K^γ}, q_{K^γ}. Let $P_F, Q_F : L_q(\ell_1(K)) \to L_q(\ell_1(F))$ be the maps induced by p_F, q_F, respectively. Let P_γ, Q_γ be the maps induced by p_γ, q_γ. Note that the quotient map $\varphi_F^* : \ell_1(K) \to \ell_1(K)/\ell_1(F)$ is given by

$$\varphi_F^*(\mu) = q_F(\mu) + \ell_1(F),$$

and $\|\phi_F^*(\mu)\| = \|q_F(\mu)\|$. The quotient map $\Phi_F^* : L_q(\ell_1(K)) \to L_q(\ell_1(K))/L_q(\ell_1(F))$ is given by

$$\Phi_F^*(f) = Q_F(f) + L_q(\ell_1(F)),$$

and $\|\Phi_F^*(f)\| = \|Q_F(f)\|$.

Note also that for any $f \in L_q(\ell_1(K))$,

$$\|P_F f\|^q + \|Q_F f\|^q \leqslant \|f\|^q.$$

Indeed, for any $t \in [0,1]$,

$$\|p_F f(t)\|^q + \|q_F f(t)\|^q \leqslant (\|p_F f(t)\| + \|q_F f(t)\|)^q = \|f(t)\|^q.$$

Integrating over t yields the inequality. In particular, if $\|Q_F f\|^q = \|\Phi_F^* f\|^q \geqslant 1 - \varepsilon^q$ and $\|f\| \leqslant 1$, then $\|P_F f\|^q \leqslant 1 - (1 - \varepsilon^q) = \varepsilon^q$. Thus if $f, g \in B_{L_q(\ell_1(K))}$, $\|f - g\| > 3\varepsilon$, and $\|\Phi_F^* f\|^q, \|\Phi_F^* g\|^q > 1 - \varepsilon^q$, then

$$\|\Phi_F^* f - \Phi_F^* g\| = \|Q_F f - Q_F g\| \geqslant \|f - g\| - \|P_F f\| - \|P_F g\| > \varepsilon.$$

We also note that if $\|\varphi_F^* \mu\|, \|\varphi_F^* \mu'\| > 1 - \varepsilon$ and $\|\mu - \mu'\| > 3\varepsilon$, then $\|\varphi_F^* \mu - \varphi_F^* \mu'\| > \varepsilon$.

We will use these fact to prove the following. Item (i) is based on [7, Lemma 3.3] and (ii) is based on [8, Lemma 6].

Lemma 2.2. *Suppose $\varepsilon > 0$, F is a closed subset of K, and β is an ordinal.*

(i) If $\mu \in s_{3\varepsilon}^\beta(B_{\ell_1(K)})$ and $\|\varphi_F^* \mu\| > 1 - \varepsilon$, $\varphi_F^* \mu \in s_\varepsilon^\beta(\varphi_F^* B_{\ell_1(K)})$.

(ii) If $f \in s_{3\varepsilon}^\beta(B_{L_q(\ell_1(K))})$ and $\|\Phi_F^* f\|^q > 1 - \varepsilon^q$, then $\Phi_F^* f \in s_\varepsilon^\beta(\Phi_F^* B_{L_q(\ell_1(K))})$.

Proof. (i) We work by induction on β, with the base and limit ordinal cases clear. Assume $\mu \in s_{3\varepsilon}^{\beta+1}(B_{\ell_1(K)})$ and $\|\varphi_F^* \mu\| > 1 - \varepsilon$. Then there exist two nets (μ_λ), (η_λ) contained in $s_{3\varepsilon}^\beta(B_{\ell_1(K)})$ indexed by the same directed set, converging w^* to μ, and such that $\|\mu_\lambda - \eta_\lambda\| > 3\varepsilon$ for all λ. By passing to a subnet and using w^*-w^* continuity, we may assume that $\|\varphi_F^* \mu_\lambda\|$, $\|\varphi_F^* \eta_\lambda\| > 1 - \varepsilon$. From this it follows that $\varphi_F^* \mu_\lambda, \varphi_F^* \eta_\lambda \in s_\varepsilon^\beta(\varphi_F^* B_{\ell_1(K)})$. By our previous remarks, $\|\varphi_F^* \mu_\lambda - \varphi_F^* \eta_\lambda\| > \varepsilon$, and since $\varphi_F^* \mu_\lambda$, $\varphi_F^* \eta_\lambda \underset{w^*}{\to} \varphi_F^* \mu$, we deduce that $\varphi_F^* \mu \in s_\varepsilon^{\beta+1}(\varphi_F^* B_{\ell_1(K)})$.

(ii) This follows from an inessential modification of (i).

□

Proposition 2.3. *Let $F \subset K$ be a closed subset of the compact, Hausdorff space K.*

(i) If F is a finite set of isolated points, $Sz(\varphi_{K \setminus F}) = 1$.

(ii) *If F is a finite, non-empty set of isolated points, $Sz(\Phi_{K\setminus F})=\omega$.*

(iii) *For any $\mu\in\ell_1(K)$ and any real number $a>0$, if $\|\varphi_1^*\mu\|>a$, then there exists a finite set F of isolated points such that $\|\varphi_{K\setminus F}^*\mu\|>a$.*

(iv) *For any $f\in L_q(\ell_1(K))$ and any real number $a>0$, if $\|\Phi_1^*f\|>a$, then there exists a finite set F of isolated points such that $\|\Phi_{K\setminus F}^*f\|>a$.*

(v) *If $\xi<CB(K)$ is a limit ordinal, $\mu\in\ell_1(K)$, and $\|\varphi_\xi^*\mu\|>a$, then there exists an ordinal $\gamma<\xi$ such that $\|\varphi_\gamma^*\mu\|>a$.*

(vi) *If $\xi<CB(K)$ is a limit ordinal, $f\in L_q(\ell_1(K))$, and $\|\Phi_\xi^*f\|>a$, then there exists an ordinal $\gamma<\xi$ such that $\|\Phi_\gamma^*f\|>a$.*

Proof. We use Proposition 2.1 for (i) and (ii).

(i) This follows from the fact that the inclusion operator $\varphi_{K\setminus F}:C_{K\setminus F}(K)\to C(K)$ has the same Szlenk index as $C_{K\setminus F}(K)$, which is 1, since $C_{K\setminus F}(K)$ has finite dimension.

(ii) This follows from the fact that $\Phi_{K\setminus F}$ has the same Szlenk index as $L_p(C_{K\setminus F}(K))\approx L_p$.

(iii) This follows from regularity and the fact that $K\setminus K'=K\setminus K^1$ is the set of isolated points in K. If $\|q_1\mu\|=|\mu|(K\setminus K')>a$, then there exists a compact, and therefore finite, subset F of $K\setminus K'$ such that $\|q_{K\setminus F}\mu\|=|\mu|(F)>a$.

(iv) One uses (iii) to deduce the result first for simple functions and then extend by density.

(v) This follows from regularity and the fact that any compact subset F of $K\setminus K^\xi$ is contained in $K\setminus K^\gamma$ for some $\gamma<\xi$. Indeed, if such a gamma did not exist, we could choose for every $\gamma<\xi$ some $x_\gamma\in F\cap K^\gamma$. Any convergent subnet of the net $(x_\gamma)_{\gamma<\xi}$ necessarily converges to a member of $K^\xi\subset K\setminus F$, contradicting the compactness of F. If $\|q_\xi\mu\|=|\mu|(K\setminus K^\xi)>a$, there exists $\gamma<\xi$ and a compact subset F of $K\setminus K^\gamma$ such that $|\mu|(F)>a$. Then $\|q_\gamma\mu\|=|\mu|(K\setminus K^\gamma)\geqslant|\mu|(F)>a$.

(vi) One uses (v) to deduce the result first for simple functions and then extend by density. □

We conclude this section with a technical fact. The general idea behind this fact is well-known. We recall the Hessenberg sum of two ordinals, the details of which can be found in [12]. Given a non-zero ordinal ξ, we may write $\xi=\omega^{\gamma_1}n_1+\ldots+\omega^{\gamma_k}n_k$, where $\gamma_1>\ldots>\gamma_k$ and $k,n_i\in\mathbb{N}$. Given two ordinals ξ,ζ, by representing them in Cantor normal and then including zero terms if necessary, we may assume there exist $k\in\mathbb{N}$, $m_i,n_i\in\mathbb{N}\cup\{0\}$, and $\gamma_1>\ldots>\gamma_k$ such that $\xi=\omega^{\gamma_1}m_1+\ldots+\omega^{\gamma_k}m_k$ and $\zeta=\omega^{\gamma_1}n_1+\ldots+\omega^{\gamma_k}n_k$. Then the Hessenberg sum of ξ,ζ is

$$\xi\oplus\zeta=\omega^{\gamma_1}(m_1+n_1)+\ldots+\omega^{\gamma_k}(m_k+n_k).$$

We remark that $(\xi\oplus\zeta)+1=(\xi+1)\oplus\zeta$. We also note that for any ordinal ξ, the set $\{(\zeta_1,\zeta_2):\zeta_1\oplus\zeta_2=\xi\}$ is finite. Last, if ξ is any ordinal and $r\in\mathbb{N}$, $\{(\zeta_1,\zeta_2):\zeta_1\oplus\zeta_2=\omega^\xi r\}=\{(\omega^\xi k,\omega^\xi(r-k):0\leqslant k\leqslant r\}$.

Lemma 2.4. *Suppose $B, L, A \subset X^*$ are w^*-compact and $B \subset L + A$.*

(i) For any $\varepsilon > 0$, $s_{2\varepsilon}(B) \subset (s_\varepsilon(L) + A) \cup (L + s_\varepsilon(A))$.

(ii) For any ordinal ξ and any $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$s^\xi_{4\varepsilon}(B) \subset \bigcup_{\zeta\oplus\eta=\xi} [s^\zeta_\varepsilon(L) + s^\eta_\varepsilon(A)].$$

(iii) If for some $\varepsilon > 0$, some ordinal ξ, and some $r \in \mathbb{N}$, $Sz_{3\varepsilon}(L) < \omega^\xi r$, then

$$s^{\omega^\xi r}_{12\varepsilon}(B) \subset L + s^{\omega^\xi}_{3\varepsilon}(A).$$

Proof. (i) If $x^* \in s_{4\varepsilon}(B)$, we may fix a net $(x^*_\lambda) \subset B$ converging w^* to x^* and such that $\|x^*_\lambda - x^*\| > 2\varepsilon$ for all λ. For each λ, write $x^*_\lambda = y^*_\lambda + z^*_\lambda \in L + A$. We may pass to a subnet twice and assume $y^*_\lambda \underset{w^*}{\to} y^* \in L$, $z^*_\lambda \underset{w^*}{\to} z^* \in A$, and either $\|y^*_\lambda - y^*\| \geqslant \|z^*_\lambda - z^*\|$ for all λ or $\|y^*_\lambda - y^*\| \leqslant \|z^*_\lambda - z^*\|$ for all λ. In the first case, it follows that $y^* \in s_\varepsilon(L)$, and in the second, $z^* \in s_\varepsilon(A)$. Since $y^* + z^* = x^*$, we deduce the first statement.

(ii) We work by induction on ξ. The $\xi = 0$ case is trivial. Assume

$$s^\xi_{4\varepsilon}(B) \subset \bigcup_{\zeta\oplus\eta=\xi} [s^\zeta_\varepsilon(L) + s^\eta_\varepsilon(A)]$$

and $x^* \in s^{\xi+1}_\varepsilon(B)$. Fix a net $(x^*_\lambda) \subset s^\xi_{4\varepsilon}(B)$ converging w^* to x^* such that $\|x^*_\lambda - x^*\| > 2\varepsilon$ for all λ. Since $\{(\zeta, \eta) : \zeta \oplus \eta = \xi\}$ is finite, we may pass to a subnet and assume that for some σ, τ with $\sigma \oplus \tau = \xi$, $x^*_\lambda \in s^\sigma_\varepsilon(B) + s^\tau_\varepsilon(L)$ for all λ. Then $x^* \in s_{2\varepsilon}(s^\sigma_\varepsilon(L) + s^\tau_\varepsilon(A))$, and we deduce by (i) that

$$x^* \in (s^{\sigma+1}_\varepsilon(L) + s^\tau_\varepsilon(A)) \cup (s^\sigma_\varepsilon(L) + s^{\tau+1}_\varepsilon(A)) \subset \bigcup_{\zeta\oplus\eta=\xi+1} [s^\zeta_\varepsilon(L) + s^\eta_\varepsilon(A)].$$

Last, assume ξ is a limit ordinal and the result holds for every $\zeta < \xi$. For every $\zeta < \xi$, $x^* \in s^{\zeta+1}_{4\varepsilon}(B)$, and there exist α_ζ, β_ζ such that $\alpha_\zeta \oplus \beta_\zeta = \zeta + 1$ and $x^* \in s^{\alpha_\zeta}_\varepsilon(L) + s^{\beta_\zeta}_\varepsilon(A)$. By [4, Proposition 2.5], there exist a subset S of $[0, \xi)$ and ordinals α, β with $\alpha \oplus \beta = \xi$, and such that either

$$\alpha \text{ is a limit ordinal}, \quad \sup_{\zeta\in S} \alpha_\zeta = \alpha, \quad \min_{\zeta\in S} \beta_\zeta \geqslant \beta,$$

or

$$\beta \text{ is a limit ordinal}, \quad \sup_{\zeta\in S} \beta_\zeta = \beta, \quad \min_{\zeta\in S} \alpha_\zeta \geqslant \alpha.$$

In either case,

$$x^* \in s^\alpha_\varepsilon(L) + s^\beta_\varepsilon(A) \subset \bigcup_{\zeta\oplus\zeta=\xi} [s^\zeta_\varepsilon(L) + s^\eta_\varepsilon(A)].$$

Indeed, in the first case, for every $\zeta \in S$, we may fix $y^*_\zeta \in s^{\alpha_\zeta}_\varepsilon(L)$ and $z^*_\zeta \in S^{\beta_\zeta}_\varepsilon(A) \subset s^\beta_\varepsilon(A)$ such that $x^* = y^*_\zeta + z^*_\zeta$. By passing to a w^*-converging subnet $(y^*_\zeta)_{\zeta\in D}$ of $(y^*_\zeta)_{\zeta\in S}$, we note that the w^*-limit must lie in $\cap_{\zeta\in S} s^\zeta_\varepsilon(L) = s^\alpha_\varepsilon(L)$, and over the same subnet, $z^*_\zeta \underset{w^*}{\to} x^* - y^* \in s^\beta_\varepsilon(A)$. Thus $x^* = y^* + z^* \in s^\alpha_\varepsilon(L) + s^\beta_\varepsilon(A)$. The other case is identical.

(*iii*) For the final statement, note that since $s_{3\varepsilon}^{\omega^\xi r}(L) = \varnothing$,

$$s_{12\varepsilon}^{\omega^\xi r}(B) \subset \bigcup_{k=0}^{r} [s_{3\varepsilon}^{\omega^\xi k}(L) + s_{3\varepsilon}^{\omega^\xi (r-k)}(A)] = \bigcup_{k=0}^{r-1} [s_{3\varepsilon}^{\omega^\xi k}(L) + s_{3\varepsilon}^{\omega^\xi (r-k)}(A)] \subset L + s_{3\varepsilon}^{\omega^\xi}(A).$$

□

3. The upper estimates

Recall that for $\gamma < CB(K)$, φ_γ denotes the canonical inclusion of $C_{K^\gamma}(K)$ into $C(K)$, $C_{K^\gamma}(K)$ is isomorphic to $C_0(K/K^\gamma)$, and $CB(K/K^\gamma) = \gamma + 1$. Moreover, Φ_γ denotes the canonical inclusion of $L_p(C_{K^\gamma}(K))$ into $L_p(C(K))$, and $L_p(C_{K^\gamma}(K))$ is isomorphic to $L_p(C_0(K/K^\gamma))$.

Theorem 3.1. *Given an ordinal ξ, consider the following statements:*

(i) A_ξ*: For any compact, Hausdorff space K such that $CB(K) \leqslant \omega^\xi$, $Sz(C_0(K)) \leqslant Sz(C(K)) \leqslant \omega^\xi$.*

(ii) B_ξ*: If $\gamma < \omega^\xi$, then for any compact, Hausdorff space K such that $\gamma < CB(K)$, if $\varphi_\gamma : C_{K^\gamma}(K) \to C(K)$ denotes the inclusion, $Sz(\varphi_\gamma) \leqslant \omega^\xi$.*

(iii) C_ξ*: For any compact, Hausdorff K such that $\omega^\xi < CB(K)$, and any $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$,*

$$\varphi_{\omega^\xi}^*(s_{3\varepsilon}^{\omega^\xi}(B_{\ell_1(K)})) \subset (1-\varepsilon)\varphi_{\omega^\xi}^* B_{\ell_1(K)}.$$

For every ordinal ξ, A_ξ, B_ξ, C_ξ hold.

Theorem 3.2. *Given an ordinal ξ, consider the following statements:*

(i) A'_ξ *: For any compact, Hausdorff space K such that $CB(K) \leqslant \omega^\xi$, $Sz(L_p(C_0(K))) \leqslant Sz(L_p(C(K))) \leqslant \omega^{1+\xi}$.*

(ii) B'_ξ *: If $\gamma < \omega^\xi$, then for any compact, Hausdorff space K such that $\gamma < CB(K)$, if $\Phi_\gamma : L_p(C_{K^\gamma}(K)) \to L_p(C(K))$ denotes the inclusion, $Sz(\Phi_\gamma) \leqslant \omega^{1+\xi}$.*

(iii) C'_ξ *: For any compact, Hausdorff K such that $\omega^\xi < CB(K)$, and any $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$,*

$$\Phi_{\omega^\xi}^*(s_{3\varepsilon}^{\omega^{1+\xi}}(B_{L_q(\ell_1(K))})) \subset (1-\varepsilon^q)^{1/q}\Phi_{\omega^\xi}^* B_{L_q(\ell_1(K))}.$$

For every ordinal ξ, A'_ξ, B'_ξ, C'_ξ hold.

The proofs of Theorems 3.1 and 3.2 are nearly identical. We will prove Theorem 3.2. In order to prove Theorem 3.1, one simply runs the same proof replacing Lemma 2.2(*ii*) and Proposition 2.3(*ii*), (*iv*), and (*vi*) with Lemma 2.2(*i*) and Proposition 2.3(*i*), (*iii*), and (*v*), respectively. This step of the proof is where our methods necessarily diverge from those used to prove upper estimates for $Sz(C(K))$ and $Sz(L_p(C(K)))$ when K is countable. The only part of the proof which requires work will be to deduce $A_{\xi+1}$ from C_ξ. Given C_ξ, it is easy to deduce that if $CB(K) = \omega^\xi + 1$, then $Sz(C(K)) \leqslant \omega^{\xi+1}$, which is a particular case of $A_{\xi+1}$. It follows from Bessaga and Pełczyński's isomorphic classification of $C(K)$ spaces for countable K that for two countable, compact, Hausdorff, infinite spaces K, L, $C(K)$ is

isomorphic to $C(L)$ if and only if $\Gamma(K) = \Gamma(L)$. Therefore for countable K, in order to deduce $A_{\xi+1}$ from C_ξ, it is sufficient to only consider the special case that $CB(K) = \omega^\xi + 1$. However, this isomorphic classification fails for uncountable compact, Hausdorff spaces, and even for uncountable intervals of ordinals. More specifically, $[0, \omega_1]$ and $[0, \omega_1 2]$ have the same Cantor-Bendixson index, $\omega_1 + 1$, while the spaces $C([0, \omega_1])$ and $C([0, \omega_1 2])$ are not isomorphic [16].

Proof of Theorem 3.2. We first prove that $A'_\xi \Rightarrow B'_\xi \Rightarrow C'_\xi$. Assume A'_ξ, K is compact, Hausdorff, $\gamma < \omega^\xi$ and $\gamma < CB(K)$. Then if $\Phi_\gamma : L_p(C_{K^\gamma}(K)) \to L_p(C(K))$ is the inclusion,

$$Sz(\Phi_\gamma) = Sz(L_p(C_{K^\gamma}(K))) = Sz(L_p(C_0(K/K^\gamma))),$$

and $CB(K/K^\gamma) = \gamma + 1 \leqslant \omega^\xi$. By A'_ξ, $Sz(\Phi_\gamma) = Sz(L_p(C_0(K/K^\gamma))) \leqslant \omega^{1+\xi}$. Thus $A'_\xi \Rightarrow B'_\xi$.

Next, assume B'_ξ holds. Assume $f \in s_{3\varepsilon}^{\omega^{1+\xi}}(B_{L_q(\ell_1(K))})$ and, to obtain a contradiction, assume $\|\Phi^*_{\omega^\xi} f\|^q > 1 - \varepsilon^q$. If $\xi = 0$, then by Proposition 2.3(iv), there exists a finite set F of isolated points such that $\|\Phi^*_{K\setminus F} f\|^q > 1 - \varepsilon^q$. If $\xi > 0$, by Proposition 2.3(vi), there exists $\gamma < \omega^\xi$ such that $\|\Phi^*_\gamma f\|^q > 1 - \varepsilon^q$. Then by Lemma 2.2, $\Phi^*_{K\setminus F} f \in s_\varepsilon^\omega(\Phi^*_{K\setminus F} B_{L_q(\ell_1(K))})$ if $\xi = 0$, and $\Phi^*_\gamma f \in s_\varepsilon^{\omega^{1+\xi}}(\Phi^*_\gamma B_{L_q(\ell_1(K))})$ if $\xi > 0$. In the case that $\xi = 0$, we obtain a contradiction to Proposition 2.3(ii), since in this case $s_\varepsilon^\omega(\Phi^*_{K\setminus F} B_{L_q(\ell_1(K))}) = \varnothing$. In the case that $\xi > 0$, we obtain a contradiction to B'_ξ, since $Sz(\Phi_\gamma) \leqslant \omega^{1+\xi}$, so $s_\varepsilon^{\omega^{1+\xi}}(\Phi^*_\gamma B_{L_q(\ell_1(K))}) = \varnothing$. In either case, the contradiction yields that $\|Q_{K^{\omega^\xi}} f\| = \|\Phi^*_{\omega^\xi} f\| \leqslant (1 - \varepsilon^q)^{1/q}$. Then

$$\Phi^*_{\omega^\xi} f = \Phi^*_{\omega^\xi} Q_{K^{\omega^\xi}} f \in (1 - \varepsilon^q)^{1/q} \Phi^*_{\omega^\xi} B_{L_q(\ell_1(K))}.$$

Thus $A'_\xi \Rightarrow B'_\xi \Rightarrow C'_\xi$.

We remark that C'_ξ is equivalent to: For any compact, Hausdorff K such that $\omega^\xi < CB(K)$, any $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, and any $a \in (0, 1]$,

$$\Phi^*_{\omega^\xi}(s_{3\varepsilon}^{\omega^{1+\xi}}(aB_{L_q(\ell_1(K))})) \subset a(1 - \varepsilon^q)^{1/q} \Phi^*_{\omega^\xi} B_{L_q(\ell_1(K))}.$$

Indeed, by homogeneity, if X is any Banach space, $L \subset X^*$ is w^*-compact, $\varepsilon > 0$, $a \in (0, 1]$, and ξ is any ordinal, $s_\varepsilon^\xi(aL) = a s_{\varepsilon/a}^\xi(L) \subset a s_\varepsilon^\xi(L)$. We apply this with $L = B_{L_q(\ell_1(K))}$ to deduce that

$$\Phi^*_{\omega^\xi}(s_{3\varepsilon}^{\omega^{1+\xi}}(aB_{L_q(\ell_1(K))})) = a\Phi^*_{\omega^\xi}(s_{3\varepsilon/a}^{\omega^{1+\xi}}(B_{L_q(\ell_1(K))})) \subset a(1 - \varepsilon^q)^{1/q} \Phi^*_{\omega^\xi} B_{L_q(\ell_1(K))}.$$

We turn now to the proof of the theorem. Since $A'_\xi \Rightarrow B'_\xi \Rightarrow C'_\xi$, it is sufficient to prove that for any ordinal ξ, A'_ξ holds given $A'_\zeta, B'_\zeta, C'_\zeta$ for every $\zeta < \xi$. Seeking a contradiction, assume there exists an ordinal ξ such that A'_ξ fails, and assume that ξ is the minimum such ordinal. We note that $\xi > 0$, since A'_0 is true. Indeed, if $CB(K) \leqslant \omega^0 = 1$, K is finite, whence $L_p(C(K)) \approx L_p$ and $Sz(L_p) = \omega$.

Assume ξ is a limit ordinal. Fix a compact, Hausdorff space K with $CB(K) \leqslant \omega^\xi$. Since $CB(K)$ cannot be a limit ordinal, $CB(K) < \omega^\xi$. Since ξ is a limit ordinal, there exists $\zeta < \xi$

such that $CB(K) < \omega^\zeta$. Since A_ζ holds, we deduce that $Sz(L_p(C(K))) \leqslant \omega^{1+\zeta} < \omega^{1+\xi}$, a contradiction. Thus ξ cannot be a limit ordinal.

It follows that ξ must be a successor, say $\xi = \zeta+1$. Since ω^ξ is a limit ordinal, $CB(K) = \omega^\xi$ is impossible for any compact, Hausdorff K, so it follows that there exists some compact, Hausdorff K such that $CB(K) < \omega^\xi$ and such that the statement of A'_ξ fails for this K. Let n be the minimum natural number such that there exists a compact, Hausdorff space K with $CB(K) \leqslant \omega^\zeta n + 1$ and such that the A'_ξ fails for this K. First suppose that $n = 1$. Then $CB(K) \leqslant \omega^\zeta + 1$. In this case it must be that $CB(K) = \omega^\zeta + 1$, since if $CB(K) \leqslant \omega^\zeta$, we would deduce that $Sz(L_p(C(K))) \leqslant \omega^{1+\zeta} < \omega^{1+\xi}$ by A'_ζ. Since K is infinite, it must be that $Sz(L_p(C_0(K))) = Sz(L_p(C(K)))$, so we compute $Sz(L_p(C_0(K)))$. Note that since $K_\infty = K^{\omega^\zeta}$, Φ_{ω^ζ} is the inculsion of $L_p(C_0(K))$ into $L_p(C(K))$. By C'_ζ, for any $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$,

$$\Phi^*_{\omega^\zeta} s^{\omega^{1+\zeta}}_{3\varepsilon}(B_{L_q(\ell_1(K))}) \subset (1-\varepsilon^q)^{1/q} \Phi^*_{\omega^\zeta} B_{L_q(\ell_1(K))}.$$

By [2, Lemma 2.5],

$$s^{\omega^{1+\zeta}}_{6\varepsilon}(\Phi^*_{\omega^\zeta} B_{L_q(\ell_1(K))}) \subset \Phi^*_{\omega^\zeta} s^{\omega^{1+\zeta}}_{3\varepsilon}(B_{L_q(\ell_1(K))}).$$

These inclusions together with a standard homogeneity argument yield that for any $j \in \mathbb{N}$, and $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$,

$$s^{\omega^{1+\zeta} j}_{6\varepsilon}(\Phi^*_{\omega^\zeta} B_{L_q(\ell_1(K))}) \subset (1-\varepsilon^q)^{j/q} \Phi^*_{\omega^\zeta} B_{L_q(\ell_1(K))},$$

from which it follows that $Sz_{6\varepsilon}(\Phi^*_{\omega^\zeta} B_{L_q(\ell_1(K))}) < \omega^{1+\zeta}\omega = \omega^{1+\xi}$. This shows that $Sz(\Phi_{\omega^\zeta}) \leqslant \omega^{1+\xi}$. Since $Sz(\Phi_{\omega^\zeta}) = Sz(L_p(C_0(K))) = Sz(L_p(C(K)))$, we reach a contradiction if $n = 1$.

Since it must be that $n > 1$, we may write $n = m + 1$. Let $F = K^{\omega^\zeta}$ and note that $CB(F) \leqslant \omega^\zeta m + 1$. Indeed,

$$F^{\omega^\zeta m+1} = (K^{\omega^\zeta})^{\omega^\zeta m+1} = K^{\omega^\zeta+\omega^\zeta m+1} = K^{\omega^\zeta n+1} = \varnothing.$$

Let $L = B_{L_p(C(F))^*} = B_{L_q(\ell_1(F))} \subset B_{L_q(\ell_1(K))}$. Recall that viewing $B_{L_q(\ell_1(F))}$ as the unit ball of $L_p(C(F))^*$ as well as the subset of $B_{L_q(\ell_1(K))}$ consisting of measures supported on F is a w^*-w^*-continuous linear isometry, so that $L \subset B_{L_q(\ell_1(K))}$ is w^*-compact and $Sz_{3\varepsilon}(L) = Sz_{3\varepsilon}(B_{L_q(\ell_1(F))}) = Sz_{3\varepsilon}(B_{L_p(C(F))^*}) \leqslant \omega^{1+\xi}$ by the minimality of n and the fact that $CB(F) \leqslant \omega^\zeta m+1$. But the usual compactness argument yields that if $Sz_{3\varepsilon}(L) \leqslant \omega^{1+\xi}$, then $Sz_{3\varepsilon}(L) < \omega^{1+\xi} = \omega^{1+\zeta}\omega$, and there exists some $r \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $Sz_{3\varepsilon}(L) < \omega^{1+\zeta} r$. We claim that for $i = 0, 1, \ldots$ and $f \in s^{\omega^{1+\zeta} ri}_{12\varepsilon}(B_{L_q(\ell_1(K))})$, $\|\Phi^*_F f\| \leqslant (1-\varepsilon^q)^{i/q}$. The $i = 0$ case is obvious. Assume we have the result for some i. Let $A = (1-\varepsilon^q)^{i/q} B_{L_q(\ell_1(K))}$. Note that our assumption on i yields that

$$s^{\omega^{1+\zeta} ri}_{12\varepsilon}(B_{L_q(\ell_1(K))}) = \{P_F f + Q_F f : f \in s^{\omega^{1+\zeta} ri}_{12\varepsilon}(B_{L_q(\ell_1(K))})\} \subset L + A.$$

Here we are using the fact that $\|P_F\| \leqslant 1$, so that P_F maps $B_{L_q(\ell_1(K))}$ into L. By Lemma 2.4,

$$s^{\omega^{1+\zeta} r(i+1)}_{12\varepsilon}(B_{L_q(\ell_1(K))}) \subset s^{\omega^{1+\zeta}}_{12\varepsilon}\left(s^{\omega^{1+\zeta} ri}_{12\varepsilon}(B_{L_q(\ell_1(K))})\right) \subset s^{\omega^{1+\zeta}}_{12\varepsilon}(L + A) \subset L + s^{\omega^{1+\zeta}}_{3\varepsilon}(A).$$

Using the equivalent version of C'_ζ given above with $a = (1-\varepsilon^q)^{i/q}$,

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi^*_{\omega^\zeta} s^{\omega^{1+\zeta}}_{3\varepsilon}(A) &= \Phi^*_{\omega^\zeta} s^{\omega^{1+\zeta}}_{3\varepsilon}(aB_{L_q(\ell_1(K))}) \subset a(1-\varepsilon^q)^{1/q}\Phi^*_{\omega^\zeta} B_{L_q(\ell_1(K))}\\ &= (1-\varepsilon^q)^{\frac{i+1}{q}}\Phi^*_{\omega^\zeta} B_{L_q(\ell_1(K))}.\end{aligned}$$

Fix $f \in s^{\omega^{1+\zeta}r(i+1)}_{12\varepsilon}(B_{L_q(\ell_1(K))}) \subset L + s^{\omega^{1+\zeta}}_{3\varepsilon}(A)$ and write $f = g + h$ with $g \in L$ and $h \in s^{\omega^{1+\zeta}}_{3\varepsilon}(A)$. Then since $\Phi^*_F|L \equiv 0$, $\Phi^*_F g = 0$. This fact together with our inclusion above yields that $\|\Phi^*_F f\| = \|\Phi^*_F h\| \leqslant (1-\varepsilon^q)^{\frac{i+1}{q}}$. This yields the inductive claim on i.

Fix $j \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $(1-\varepsilon^q)^{j/q} < \varepsilon$. For any $f \in s^{\omega^{1+\zeta}rj}_{12\varepsilon}(B_{L_q(\ell_1(K))})$, $f = P_{\omega^\zeta} f + Q_{\omega^\zeta} f$, $P_{\omega^\zeta} f \in L$, and

$$\|Q_{\omega^\zeta} f\| = \|\Phi^*_{\omega^\zeta} f\| \leqslant (1-\varepsilon^q)^{j/q} < \varepsilon.$$

Therefore

$$s^{\omega^{1+\zeta}rj}_{12\varepsilon}(B_{L_q(\ell_1(K))}) \subset L + \varepsilon B_{L_q(\ell_1(K))}.$$

Using Proposition 2.1(vi),

$$\begin{aligned}s^{\omega^{1+\zeta}r(j+1)}_{12\varepsilon}(B_{L_q(\ell_1(K))}) &\subset s^{\omega^{1+\zeta}r}_{12\varepsilon}\big(s^{\omega^{1+\zeta}rj}_{12\varepsilon}(B_{L_q(\ell_1(K))})\big) \subset s^{\omega^{1+\zeta}r}_{12\varepsilon}(L + \varepsilon B_{L_q(\ell_1(K))})\\ &\subset s^{\omega^{1+\zeta}r}_{3\varepsilon}(L) + \varepsilon B_{L_q(\ell_1(K))} = \varnothing.\end{aligned}$$

But this shows that $Sz_{12\varepsilon}(B_{L_q(\ell_1(K))}) < \omega^{1+\zeta}r(j+1) < \omega^{1+\xi}$. Since $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$ was arbitrary, we deduce that $Sz(B_{L_q(\ell_1(K))}) \leqslant \omega^{1+\xi}$, and this contradiction finishes the proof.

□

4. The lower estimates

Lemma 4.1. *Let K be compact, Hausdorff and fix $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$. For any ordinal $\xi < CB(K)$, $B_{\ell_1(K^\xi)} \subset s^\xi_\varepsilon(B_{\ell_1(K)}) \cap d^{\omega^\xi}_\varepsilon(B_{\ell_1(K)})$.*

Proof. We prove the results separately for the Szlenk and w^*-dentability indices, each by induction. We first prove that $B_{\ell_1(K^\xi)} \subset s^\xi_\varepsilon(B_{\ell_1(K)})$. The base and limit ordinal cases are clear. Assume $K^{\xi+1} \neq \varnothing$ and $B_{\ell_1(K^\xi)} \subset s^\xi_\varepsilon(B_{\ell_1(K)})$. Fix any finite, non-empty subset F of $K^{\xi+1}$ and scalars $(a_x)_{x\in F}$ such that $\sum_{x\in F}|a_x| \leqslant 1$. Let $\mu = \sum_{x\in F} a_x\delta_x$ and let V be any w^*-neighborhood of μ. Fix $f_1,\dots,f_n \in C(K)$, and $\sigma > 0$ such that

$$\{\eta \in \ell_1(K) : (\forall 1 \leqslant i \leqslant n)(|\langle \mu, f_i\rangle - \langle \eta, f_i\rangle| < \sigma)\} \subset V.$$

For each $x \in F$, fix a neighborhood U_x of x such that for each $1 \leqslant i \leqslant n$ and each $y \in U_x$, $|f_i(x) - f_i(y)| < \sigma$. We may assume that the sets $(U_x)_{x\in F}$ are pairwise disjoint. Since the points $x \in F$ are not isolated in K^ξ, for each $x \in F$ we may fix $y_x \in U_x \cap K^\xi$ such that $y_x \neq x$. Let $E = \{y_x : x \in F\}$. Let $\eta = \sum_{x\in F} a_x\delta_{y_x}$ and note that $\eta \in V \cap B_{\ell_1(K^\xi)} \subset V \cap s^\xi_\varepsilon(B_{\ell_1(K)})$. Since $K^{\xi+1} \neq \varnothing$, K^ξ is infinite, and we may find some $\eta' \in \operatorname{span}\{\delta_t : t \in K^\xi \setminus (E\cup F)\} \cap_{i=1}^n \ker(f_i)$. By scaling, we may assume $\|\eta'\| = 1 - \|\eta\|$. Then $\eta + \eta' \in V \cap B_{\ell_1(K^\xi)}$ and

$$\|\mu - (\eta+\eta')\| = \|\mu\| + \|\eta\| + \|\eta'\| \geqslant 1 > \varepsilon.$$

Since V was arbitrary, we deduce that $\mu \in s_\varepsilon^{\xi+1}(B_{\ell_1(K)})$. This shows that the members of $B_{\ell_1(K^\xi)}$ with finite support lie in $s_\varepsilon^{\xi+1}(B_{\ell_1(K)})$. Since such measures are dense in $B_{\ell_1(K^\xi)}$ and since $s_\varepsilon^{\xi+1}(B_{\ell_1(K)})$ is w^*-closed, we deduce the successor case.

We next prove the statement concerning the w^*-dentability index, also by induction. Again, the base and limit cases are trivia. Assume $K^{\xi+1} \neq \varnothing$ and assume $B_{\ell_1(K^\xi)} \subset d_\varepsilon^{\omega\xi}(B_{\ell_1(K)})$. For each $n = 0, 1, \ldots$, let

$$A_n = \Big\{ \frac{1}{2^n} \sum_{t\in F} \varepsilon_t \delta_t : |\varepsilon_t| = 1, F \subset K^\xi, |F| = 2^n \Big\} \subset B_{\ell_1(K^\xi)} \subset d_\varepsilon^{\omega\xi}(B_{\ell_1(K)}).$$

We claim that for every $m = 0, 1, \ldots$ and every $n \geqslant m$, $A_n \subset d_\varepsilon^{\omega\xi+m}(B_{\ell_1(K)})$. The inductive hypothesis yields the result for each n when $m = 0$. Assume that for some m and every $n \geqslant m$, $A_n \subset d_\varepsilon^{\omega\xi+m}(B_{\ell_1(K)})$. Fix some $n \geqslant m+1$ and some $\mu = \frac{1}{2^n}\sum_{t\in F} \varepsilon_t\delta_t \in A_n$. Let F_1, F_2 be a partition of F with $|F_1| = |F_2| = 2^{n-1}$. Then $\mu_1 := \frac{1}{2^{n-1}}\sum_{t\in F_1} \varepsilon_t\delta_t$, $\mu_2 := \frac{1}{2^{n-1}}\sum_{t\in F_2} \varepsilon_t\delta_t \in A_{n-1} \subset d_\varepsilon^{\omega\xi+m}(B_{\ell_1(K)})$. Moreover, $\mu = \frac{1}{2}\mu_1 + \frac{1}{2}\mu_2$. Let S be any w^*-open slice containing μ, and note that this slice must contain either μ_1 or μ_2 by convexity. But

$$\|\mu - \mu_1\| = \|\mu - \mu_2\| = \frac{1}{2}\|\mu_1 - \mu_2\| = 1 > \varepsilon,$$

so that $\operatorname{diam}(S \cap d_\varepsilon^{\omega\xi+m}(B_{\ell_1(K)})) > \varepsilon$. From this it follows that $\mu \in d_\varepsilon^{\omega\xi+m+1}(B_{\ell_1(K)})$. This yields the claim concerning A_n.

Next, we note that for any $x \in K^{\xi+1}$, any unimodular scalar a, and any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $a\delta_x \in \overline{A}_n^{w^*}$. Indeed, fix $f_1, \ldots, f_k \in C(K)$ and $\eta > 0$. Fix a neighborhood U of x such that for every $y \in U$ and $1 \leqslant i \leqslant k$, $|f_i(y) - f_i(x)| < \eta$. Fix any finite subset $F \subset K^\xi$ of U with $|F| = 2^n$, as we may, since x is not isolated in K^ξ. Then if $\mu = \frac{1}{2^n}\sum_{t\in F} a\delta_t \in A_n$, $|\langle f_i, a\delta_x\rangle - \langle f_i, \mu\rangle| < \eta$ for $i = 1, \ldots, k$. This yields that $a\delta_x \in \overline{A}_n^{w^*} \subset \overline{d_\varepsilon^{\omega\xi+n}(B_{\ell_1(K)})}^{w^*} = d_\varepsilon^{\omega\xi+n}(B_{\ell_1(K)})$. From this we deduce that $a\delta_x \in \cap_{n<\omega} \delta_\varepsilon^{\omega\xi+n}(B_{\ell_1(K)}) = d_\varepsilon^{\omega\xi+\omega}(B_{\ell_1(K)}) = d_\varepsilon^{\omega(\xi+1)}(B_{\ell_1(K)})$. Since $d_\varepsilon^{\omega(\xi+1)}(B_{\ell_1(K)})$ is w^*-closed and convex, it follows that

$$B_{\ell_1(K^{\xi+1})} = \overline{\operatorname{co}}^{w^*}\{a\delta_x : |a| = 1, x \in K^{\xi+1}\} \subset d_\varepsilon^{\omega(\xi+1)}(B_{\ell_1(K)}).$$

□

Corollary 4.2. *For any compact, Hausdorff space K and any $1 < p < \infty$, $Sz(C(K)) = \Gamma(K)$ and $Dz(C(K)) = Sz(L_p(C(K))) = \omega\Gamma(K)$.*

Proof. We will use Proposition 2.1 throughout. Since $Dz(C(K)) \leqslant L_p(C(K))$, it suffices to prove that $\omega\Gamma(K) \leqslant Dz(C(K))$ and $Sz(L_p(C(K))) \leqslant \omega\Gamma(K)$ in order to see that $Dz(C(K)) = Sz(L_p(C(K))) = \omega\Gamma(K)$.

By Lemma 4.1, if K is not scattered, $C(K)$, and therefore $L_p(C(K))$, is not Asplund. From this it follows that

$$Sz(C(K)) = Dz(C(K)) = Sz(L_p(C(K))) = \omega\Gamma(K) = \infty.$$

Assume K is scattered. In this case, $CB(K)$ is an ordinal and there exists an ordinal ξ such that $\Gamma(K) = \omega^\xi$. By the definition of $\Gamma(K)$, $CB(K) \leqslant \omega^\xi$. From Theorems 3.1 and 3.2, $Sz(C(K)) \leqslant \omega^\xi = \Gamma(K)$ and $Sz(L_p(C(K))) \leqslant \omega^{1+\xi} = \omega\Gamma(K)$.

If $CB(K) = 1$, $Sz(C(K)) = 1$ and $Dz(C(K)) = \omega$, since $C(K)$ is finite-dimensional and non-zero. This yields the result in the trivial case that K is finite. Otherwise $CB(K) = \zeta+1$ for some ordinal ζ and there exists an ordinal ξ such that $\omega^\xi < \zeta + 1 < \omega^{\xi+1} = \Gamma(K)$. By Lemma 4.1, $B_{\ell_1(K^\zeta)} \subset s^\zeta_{1/2}(B_{\ell_1(K)}) \cap d^{\omega\zeta}_{1/2}(B_{\ell_1(K)})$, and it follows that $Sz_{1/2}(B_{\ell_1(K)}) > \zeta > \omega^\xi$ and $Dz_{1/2}(B_{\ell_1(K)}) > \omega\zeta > \omega^{1+\xi}$. Therefore we deduce that $\omega^\xi < Sz(C(K)) \leqslant \omega^{\xi+1}$, and since $Sz(C(K)) = \omega^\gamma$ for some ordinal γ, $Sz(C(K)) = \omega^{\xi+1}$. We deduce from $\omega^{1+\xi} < Dz(C(K)) \leqslant \omega^{1+\xi+1}$ that $Dz(C(K)) \geqslant \omega^{1+\xi+1}$ similarly.

□

References

[1] C. Bessaga, A. Pełczyński, *Spaces of continuous functions IV*, Studia Math. 19 (1960) 53-62.

[2] P.A.H. Brooker, *Asplund operators and the Szlenk index*, Operator Theory 68 (2012) 405-442.

[3] P.A.H. Brooker, *Szlenk and w^*-dentability indices of the Banach spaces $C([0,\alpha])$*, Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications 399 (2013) 559-564.

[4] R.M. Causey, *Proximity to ℓ_p and c_0 in Banach spaces*, J. Funct. Anal., (2015) 10.1016/j.jfa.2015.10.001.

[5] J. Diestel, J. J. Uhl, Jr., *Vector measures*, Mathematical Surveys and Monographs Volume 15, American Mathematical Society, Rhode Island 1977.

[6] R. Deville, G. Godefroy, V. Zizler, *Smoothness and renormings in Banach spaces*, Pitman Monographs and Surveys in Pure and Applied Mathematics, vol. 64, Longman Scientific & Technical, Harlow 1993.

[7] P. Hájek, G. Lancien, *Various slicing indices on Banach spaces*, Mediterr. J. Math. 4(2007) 179-190.

[8] P. Hájek, G. Lancien, A. Procházka, *Weak* dentability index of spaces $C([0,\alpha])$*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 353 (2009) no. 1, 239-243.

[9] P. Hájek and Th. Schlumprecht, *The Szlenk index of $L_p(X)$*, Bull. Lond. Math. Soc. 46 (2014) no. 2, 415-424.

[10] G. Lancien, *On the Szlenk index and the weak*-dentability index*, Quarterly J. Math. Oxford, 47(1996) 59-71.

[11] G. Lancien, *A survey on the Szlenk index and some of its applications*, RACSAM Rev. R. Acad. Cienc. Exactas F'is. Nat. Ser. A Mat. 100(2006), 209-235.

[12] J.D. Monk. *Introduction to set theory*, McGraw-Hill, (1969).

[13] I. Namioka, R. R. Phelps, *Banach spaces which are Asplund spaces*, Duke Math. J., 42, (1975) no. 4, 735-750.

[14] W. Rudin, *Continuous Functions on Compact Spaces Without Perfect Subsets*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., 8 (1957) no. 1, 39-42.

[15] C. Samuel, *Indice de Szlenk des C(K), Séminaire de Géométrie des espaces de Banach*, Vol. I-II, Publications Mathématiques de l'Université Paris VII, Paris (1983) 81-91.

[16] Z. Semadeni, *Banach spaces non isomorphic to their cartesian squares II*, Bulletin de l'Académie Polonaise des Sciences, Série Math. Astron. et Phys., 8 (1960) 81-84.

[17] C. Stegall, *The Radon-Nikodym Property in Conjugate Banach Spaces*, Trans. of the Amer. Math. Soc., 206 (1975) 213-223.

[18] W. Szlenk, *The non existence of a separable reflexive Banach space universal for all separable reflexive Banach spaces*, Studia Math. 30 (1968) 53-61.